

Project Managers' Advisory Group

MINUTES March 17, 2008

Attending:

(* = by phone)

Bob Giannuzzi	EPMO
Jim Tulenko	EPMO
Charles Richards	EPMO
Kathy Bromead	EPMO
Barbara Swartz	EPMO
Jesus Lopez	EPMO
Alisa Cutler*	EPMO
John McShane*	EPMO
Gaye Mays*	EPMO
Caroline Jackson	DHHS DPH
Dave Butts	WRC
Lynne Beck	DHHS DMH/DD/SAS
Cheryl Ritter	DOT
Jim Skinner	DOI
Bruce Humphrey*	NCCCS
Chris Cline	NCCCS
Vicky Kumar	OSC
LaQuita Hudson	ITS

Bob Giannuzzi welcomed everyone to the meeting. This was the first meeting to pilot using a conference bridge. Since it worked out well, future meetings will have attendance via phone as an option.

Jesus Lopez announced that Ravi Shanmugam (DOT), James Myers (ITS), and Karen Burke (DHHS) recently passed the PMP certification exam. James and Ravi were participants in the EPMO prep classes.

Bob solicited and received approval of the February minutes.

Jesus reported that Cycle 7 of the EPMO's PMP Exam Prep class will kickoff on April 1. He still needed an instructor for the Time Management class (since filled).

Kathy Bromead had letters of recognition from the SCIO for the 6 members from the last 2 cycles of prep classes who recently received their PMP certifications.

NCPMI news was covered next. **John McShane** has been named VP of Programs. He reported that the next Public Sector LIG to be held on April 3 will feature a presentation by Jill Mertens on *A Framework for Technology Evaluation*. The March 26 PMO Committee (LIG) was to have George Fenton speaking on *Microsoft Visual Studio Team System/Team Foundation Server 2005 & the PMO*. The Chapter meeting on March 20 was to feature Gary Evans' talk on *Opportunity – The Other Side of Risk*. **Vicky Kumar** advised that NCPMI has an exposure draft of PMBOK 4th Edition on the website and was soliciting feedback by 3/22.

Bob Giannuzzi called for updates from the Task Groups.

- *PM Tools* **Jim Tulenko** reported that the overview of scheduling and portfolio management tool assessments were reviewed with the SCIO. A decision was made to upgrade the current PPM tool to Microsoft PPS 2006. Other solutions were viewed as unaffordable at this time but will be revisited down the road. **Caroline Jackson** inquired on the benefits of the upgrade. **Jim** responded that PPS 2006 is supported by Microsoft (Current tool is not) and it includes some beneficial fixes. Document management is much improved with Sharepoint functionality under the covers.
- *Methodology* **Alisa Cutler** reported that drafts of the proposed gate checklists will be piloted by 5 or 6 projects over the next few weeks. There has been positive feedback to date. **Dave Butts** asked if there will be a checklist for registrations. Alisa replied that there is one, but there needs to be a separate one for those that are part of a program (reporting required).

Bob passed out the following information on upcoming teleconferences of interest to the PM Advisory Group. He pointed out that the vendor management and PM accountability topics should be of particular interest.

Organization/website	Contacts	Upcoming Calls
NASCIO http://www.nascio.org/committees/projectmanagement/	Stephanie Jamison 859/514-9148 sjamison@AMRms.com Access 888/272-7337 conference ID 6916986	TBD – no topics on the horizon Opportunity for a State PM to present
PMO Executive Council http://www.pmo.executiveboard.com/	Register at website	<u>March 19</u> (12:00) Optimizing the EPMO's Role in Supporting Business Goals
CIO Executive Council http://www.cio.executiveboard.com/	Register at website	<u>March 18</u> (12:00) Tools for Managing M&A Integration
Application Executive Council http://www.aec.executiveboard.com/	Register at website	<u>March 20</u> (11:00) Improving Outsourcing Vendor Management Skills <u>April 10</u> (11:00) Maximizing Requirements Management Efficiency
Infrastructure Executive Council http://www.iec.executiveboard.com/	Register at website	<u>March 19</u> (10:00) Incident Management: Tactics to Reduce MTTR and Total Incident Volumes <u>April 16</u> (10:00) Problem Management: Ensuring Accountability and Data Consistency
Information Risk Executive Council	Register at website	<u>April 10</u> (11:00) End-User Awareness Series II:

http://www.irec.executiveboard.com/		Segmenting Communication Strategies to Drive Lasting Behavior Change
Enterprise Architecture Executive Council http://www.eaec.executiveboard.com/	Register at website	<u>March 20</u> (12:00) Enabling Agility through Architecture Governance <u>April 17</u> (12:00) Standardizing Integration of Architecture Principles

Kathy Bromead discussed the draft of the first quarterly EPMO newsletter and solicited feedback. **Barbara Swartz** advised that the EPMO website will have new information by the end of the month. Besides the newsletter, it will include training schedules and process updates.

Training was the next topic of discussion. **John McShane** reported that the Business Analyst Boot Camp onsite class that starts on May 6 and the Requirements class commencing June 2 are both full. He's looking into classes on Estimating and Scheduling as well as Negotiation/Procurement.

Jim Tulenko reported on PPM tool activity. The PPM team was scheduled to deploy the new release on March 28. **Jim** presented key changes in first status reports and Program processes. Closeout process changes will follow. **Bob Giannuzzi** reported that one of his projects successfully exercised the new process for first reports.

Kathy Bromead discussed the criteria that define what is a project. An activity is a project if there is new functionality or enhancements. The topic is discussed in the newsletter. **Jesus Lopez** recommended that if there is a procurement involved, the PMA should be contacted for advice. Otherwise, when the request for posting goes to ITS Procurement, the EPMO is asked for review and whether a project is required to be entered in the PPM tool.

Bob discussed the attached lessons learned from the MFTS project at DOR. He highlighted the benefit of ongoing involvement of the sponsor and executive management. He also pointed out that vendor manager issues cited are pervasive on several projects in the state portfolio.

Meeting adjourned at 4:38.

NEXT MEETING
Monday, April 21, 2008
ITS Conference Room 2
Bob to arrange a phone bridge

Lessons Learned Documentation

Exhibit A

Department of Revenue - Motor Fuels Tracking System

1. **LESSONS LEARNED** - What were the positive lessons learned (project strengths) from this effort?

It was critical to have clear requirements and to have a contract that required the vendor to meet the deliverables to the quality satisfaction of the agency. DOR established clear acceptance criteria for Systems Test and User Acceptance Test that proved invaluable.

Involvement of key senior executives from the agency who could interface on short notice with the executives of the vendor was very beneficial. The executive sponsors were the Assistant Secretary Tax Compliance and the Assistant Secretary Information Technology. Also on the sponsor team were the division director and assistant director. For most of the project, the sponsor team met weekly but not less than every two weeks. During the key decision times the Deputy Secretary attended the sponsor meetings. On at least two occasions the Secretary met with the sponsor team and the executives from the vendor to discuss the schedule issues and the department's commitment to getting a quality product at the signed contract cost.

2. **LESSONS LEARNED** - What opportunities for improvements (project weaknesses) were learned with this project?

In retrospect, it would likely have been more beneficial to have the vendor working on site at DOR, or at least some portion of the vendor staff, for more of the project, especially the development phase. While the vendor was present for the design, the later stages had less face-to-face interaction.

Tighter finalization of the project schedule at the outset of the project by the DOR Project Manager would have eliminated some of the confusion regarding deliverable slippage. This was not a major issue but would have been done better.

The language in the original RFP regarding liquidated damages and penalties could have been clearer. DOR has since worked with the AG's office (and ITS) to refine this language for subsequent procurements.